

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

Claims 1, 15, 16, 18, 25, 26, and 28 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at ¶¶ [0069]-[0070] of the published application. Thus, claims 1-18 and 20-28 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In light of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

### **II. The Provisional Double Patenting Rejection Is Acknowledged**

Claims 1-18 and 20-28 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 and 20-28 of copending Application No. 10/574,141 and claims 1-22 and 24-35 of copending Application No. 10/574,140. The Applicants acknowledge this **provisional** rejection and will address the rejection if the claims of the applications are deemed allowable and remain subject of a non-provisional double patenting rejection.

### **III. The Claim Objections Should Be Withdrawn**

Claims 1 and 18 stand objected to due to informalities. With respect to the term “optical characteristic” recited in claim 1, the Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to the claim element reciting “a display driver for controlling *an optical characteristic* of each pixel.” This element is recited prior to the objected language of “a predetermined viewing angle dependency of *said optical characteristic*.” Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn. With respect to the remaining objections, the Applicants have amended the claim language to overcome the objections. In view of the amendments to these claims, the withdrawal of the further objections is respectfully requested.

**IV. The 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection Should Be Withdrawn**

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claim 28 has been amended to include the language suggested by the Examiner to overcome the §101 rejection. (See 11/10/09 Office Action, p. 4). Therefore, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections Should Be Withdrawn**

Claims 1-14, 18, 20-24, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Balogh (U.S. Published App. No. 2001/0028356) in view of Andrade et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,954,193).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, “[a] display device for displaying a three dimensional image such that different views are displayed according to different viewing angles, the display device including: a display panel having a plurality of separately addressable pixels for displaying said image, the pixels being grouped such that different pixels in a group correspond to different views of the image as a function of an angle with respect to a first axis; a display driver for controlling an optical characteristic of each pixel to generate an image according to received image data; and a colour compensation device for further controlling light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels within a group to compensate for a predetermined viewing angle dependency of said optical characteristic in a second axis of the display panel, wherein the second axis is transverse to the first axis.”

The Examiner correctly acknowledges that Balogh fails to disclose a colour compensation device for further controlling light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels within a group to compensate for a predetermined viewing angle dependency of an optical characteristic. (See 11/10/09 Office Action, p. 5). To cure this deficiency, the Examiner refers to Andrade which discloses a method utilizing correction factors to compensate for variation in viewing angles between pixel locations and a user’s viewing position to provide a consistent visual appearance with respect to a viewing position. (See Andrade, col. 4, ll. 12-15). Claim 1 has been amended to recite a “colour compensation

device for further controlling light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels within a group to compensate for a predetermined *viewing angle dependency of said optical characteristic in a second axis of the display panel, wherein the second axis is transverse to the first axis.*” Neither Balogh nor Andrade contain any disclosure or suggestion with respect to a colour compensation device operating in a manner analogous to the above recitation of claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Balogh nor Andrade disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1 and that claim 1 is allowable. Because claims 2-14 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable.

Claim 18 contains limitations substantially similar to those of claim 1. Thus it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 and its dependent claims 20-24 and 28 are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons presented with regards to claim 1.

Claims 15-17 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Balogh in view of Andrade and further in view of Mochizuku (U.S. Patent No. 6,386,720).

The Examiner asserts that Mochizuku teaches “that the inherent optical characteristics of the display panel are configured such that the viewing angle dependence is reduced or substantially minimized relative to the y-axis and the colour compensation device serves to reduce or substantially minimize viewing angle dependence relative to an axis that is transverse to the y-axis.” (See 11/10/09 Office Action, p. 11). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Mochizuki teaches a light source comprising an acrylic plate in which LEDs serve as a light source at one side of the plate. (See Mochizuki, col. 3, ll. 15-25). A mirror reflects light from the LEDs. The top and bottom surfaces of the plate, which emit the reflected light, are rough. The problem that Mochizuki tries to cure is an increased

luminance at the center of the plate and diminished luminance towards the edges of the plate. (See Id., col. 1, ll. 22-27). To remedy this problem, Mochizuki teaches scattering portions that increase in area away from the LEDs along the x-axis. (See Id., col. 5, l. 66-col. 6, l. 1). To compensate for the light distribution in the y-direction, Mochizuki individually adjusts the luminance of each LED. (See Id., col. 6, ll. 10-11). The result is a uniform luminance over the surface of the acrylic plate. (See Id., col. 6, ll. 30-36). Although this cures the luminance problem, it would not cure a view angle dependency. Viewing angle dependency relates to pixels, not light sources. Mochizuki's resulting display that exhibits a uniform luminance over the entire display would still exhibit a viewing angle dependency. In fact, Mochizuki does not even address the issue of a viewing angle dependency. Claim 1 recites controlling *light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels*. Mochizuki is only concerned with the problem of irregular luminance not controlling *light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels*. Accordingly, Mochizuki fails to disclose "a grey scale compensation device for further controlling light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels within a group to compensate for a predetermined viewing angle dependency of said optical characteristic in a second axis of the display panel, wherein the second axis is transverse to the first axis," as recited in claims 1 and 18.

Furthermore, Mochizuku is clearly limited to controlling a "luminance irregularity." There is no teaching or suggestion with respect to colour compensation device "to compensate for a predetermined viewing angle dependency of said optical characteristic in a second axis of the display panel, wherein the second axis is transverse to the first axis," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Mochizuku fails to cure the deficiencies of Balogh and Andrade with respect to claims 1 and 18. Because claims 15-17 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable. Because claims 25-27 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 18, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: January 11, 2010

By: 

Michael J. Marciniak (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marciniak, LLP  
150 Broadway, Suite 702  
New York, NY 10038  
Phone: 212-619-6000  
Fax: 212-619-0276

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
**Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.**  
**Senior IP Counsel**  
**Philips Electronics North America Corp.**  
**P.O. Box 3001**  
**Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001**  
**Phone: (914) 333-9618**